

REMARKS

Claims 12 - 31 were pending in the present application for patent as of the Office Action of March 1, 2004. In the Office Action of March 1, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 12 - 15, 18, 20 - 23, 25, and 27 - 30 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by the Applicants Admitted Prior Art (AAPA), and rejected claims 16, 17, 19, 24, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applicants' admitted prior art in view of U.S. Publication Number 2002/0079552, Koike.

Claims 12 - 15, 18, 20 - 23, 25, and 27 - 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by the AAPA. Generally, claims 12, 20, and 27 have been amended to claim that the bond pad is substantially directly over a width of an electrical conductor in the final interconnect layer. Also, claims 12, 20, and 27 have been amended to claim that the bond pad is electrically isolated from the electrical conductor located under the pad by only the passivation layer. Claims 21, 24 - 26, and 29 have been cancelled because the subject matter of those claims has been included in their respective independent claims. The AAPA does not show or suggest a method as claimed in amended claims 12 - 15, 18, 20, 22, 23, 27, 28, 30, and 31. Therefore, the applicants believe that claims 12 - 15, 18, 20, 22, 23, 27, 28, 30, and 31, as amended herein, are allowable over the AAPA.

Claims 16, 17, 19, 24, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA in view of Koike. Claim 24 has been canceled. The comments and amendments above regarding the section 102 rejection of claims 12 - 15, 18, 20 - 23, 25, and 27 - 30 also apply to the rejection of claims 16, 17, 19, 24, and 31. The AAPA in view of Koike does not show or suggest a method as claimed in amended claims 16, 17, 19, and 31. Therefore, the applicants believe that claims 16, 17, 19, and 31 are allowable over the AAPA in view of Koike.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless the applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.


Believing to have responded to each and every rejection contained in the Office Action mailed March 1, 2004, the applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and allowance of claims 12 - 20, 22, 23, 27, 28, 30, and 31; thereby placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Freescall Semiconductor, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number: 23125

By: 

Daniel D. Hill
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 35,895
Telephone: (512) 996-6839
Fax No.: (512) 996-6854